



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

June 26, 2014

Marcelo Calle
Office of Surface Mining
Western Region
1999 Broadway, Suite 3320
Denver, Colorado 80202-5733

Harrilene Yazzi
Bureau of Indian Affairs
Navajo Regional Office
301 West Hill Street
P.O. Box 1060
Gallup, New Mexico 87305

Subject: EPA Comments on the Four Corners Power Plant and Navajo Mine Energy Project Draft
Environmental Impact Statement, Navajo Nation, San Juan County, New Mexico
(CEQ # 20140097)

Dear Mr. Calle:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the above-referenced document pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and our NEPA review authority under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Our detailed comments are enclosed.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) assesses the impacts from the continued operation of the Four Corners Power Plant (FCPP), a coal-fired power plant with a generating capacity of up to 1,500 megawatts (2 units), should the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) approve Arizona Public Service Company's proposed lease amendment and application for right-of-way renewals for operation through 2041. The project also involves continued and extended surface coal mining at the Navajo Mine, should the Office of Surface Mining (OSM) renew the Navajo Mine's existing Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) permit for 5 years and approve an application for a new SMCRA permit for the Pinabete Permit Area. Lastly, the project proposes right-of-way renewals by BIA for portions of four transmission lines.

EPA is a cooperating agency for the proposed project and provided comments on the Preliminary DEIS to the OSM and BIA on February 6, 2014. We found the DEIS to be largely responsive to our comments, and appreciate the changes made to the document to address them. Comments that were not fully addressed are reiterated in the attached Detailed Comments. Based on our review of the DEIS, we have rated the Preferred Alternative A as *Environmental Concerns – Insufficient Information* (EC-2) (see enclosed "Summary of Rating Definitions"). Our concerns regard the existing contamination of groundwater from coal combustion residue (CCR) disposal and the need for enforceable commitments regarding future CCR management, monitoring and remediation. We also have concerns regarding the


assessment of cumulative health impacts from continued operation of the project, given the severely compromised existing public health environment.

Pollutants from the disposal of CCR have contaminated groundwater at the FCPP. The DEIS includes a number of voluntary measures to be taken by Arizona Public Service (APS) regarding operations, design, groundwater monitoring, corrective action, and closure and post-closure of CCR disposal facilities at the FCPP. Because future regulations by EPA regarding CCR management may not apply on Tribal lands, we strongly recommend that the voluntary measures be incorporated as conditions of approval by the BIA in the event it approves APS's proposed lease amendment and application for right-of-way renewals. Groundwater contamination from past disposal of CCR in Navajo Mine has also occurred and we recommend monitoring of groundwater at the Navajo Mine to confirm the DEIS conclusions that constituents of concern would be attenuated as groundwater travels towards the San Juan River and the Chaco Rivers.

The DEIS concludes that that cumulative impacts to public health from both the FCPP and the Mine would be minor. Emissions of some pollutants from the power plant will be reduced as a result of EPA's Federal Implementation Plan - Best Available Retrofit Technology, and these reductions are expected to have a positive impact on public health. Nevertheless, as disclosed in the DEIS, health outcomes for Navajo, in term of life expectancy and mortality rates, are worse than for the general population in San Juan County, partly due to healthcare disparities. The cumulative health burden also includes the impacts from in-home burning of coal that is provided by the Navajo Mine to local tribal members free or at low-cost. This coal is often burned in improperly-vented stoves not designed to burn coal. Because many Navajo do not have access, or affordable access, to electricity, the provision of free or cheap coal by the project directly contributes to the cumulative health burden from indoor exposure to coal smoke. We recommend that the Final EIS incorporate the severely compromised existing public health environment into its cumulative health impacts assessment and include commitments to mitigation for the project's contribution to the ongoing environmental justice and cumulative health impacts. Please see the enclosed Detailed Comments for our recommendations regarding mitigation.

EPA appreciates the opportunity to review this DEIS and looks forward to continued coordination with OSM, BIA, and the other cooperating agencies during the NEPA process. When the Final EIS is released for public review, please send one copy to the address above (mail code: CED-2). If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 972-3521, or contact Karen Vitulano, the lead reviewer for this project, at 415-947-4178 or vitulano.karen@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kathleen Martyn Goforth", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Kathleen Martyn Goforth, Manager
Environmental Review Section

Enclosure: Summary of EPA Rating Definitions
EPA's Detailed Comments

cc: Ben Shelly, President, Navajo Nation
Stephen B. Etsitty, EPA Director, Navajo Nation
Herman Honanie, Chairman, Hopi Tribe
Gayl Honanie, Environmental Director, Hopi Tribe

SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize EPA's level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the EIS.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THE ACTION

"LO" (Lack of Objections)

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

"EC" (Environmental Concerns)

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EO" (Environmental Objections)

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

"EU" (Environmentally Unsatisfactory)

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT

Category 1" (Adequate)

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

"Category 2" (Insufficient Information)

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

"Category 3" (Inadequate)

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analysed in the draft EIS, which should be analysed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

*From EPA Manual 1640, "Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment."

Coal Combustion Residue (CCR) Management and Contamination

CCR management at the Four Corners Power Plant

EPA expects to finalize the CCR rule by the end of 2014, which will determine whether CCR is managed as hazardous waste under Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as solid waste under Subtitle D of RCRA, or in some other manner. The DEIS indicates that CCR at the Four Corners Power Plant will be managed in accordance with this final EPA determination, and notes that, if EPA regulates CCR through Subtitle D, the authority to implement the regulations would be at the state level, which would not apply on tribal lands (p. 4.15-5). OSM proposes mitigation to address this regulatory gap, and we agree this is necessary. However, the DEIS identifies the mitigation measures as voluntary recommendations to Arizona Public Service, while also portraying them as if they were legal requirements. For example, on page 4.15-27, the DEIS states that both new and existing disposal units would be subject to groundwater monitoring requirements and, if certain hazardous constituents are detected at a level exceeding groundwater protection standards, the FCPP would have 90 days to assess corrective measures and select a remedy that would protect human health and the environment. It is not clear what groundwater protection standards are being referenced. The DEIS notes that the Navajo Nation does not have groundwater quality standards (p. 4.15-18). Additionally, the specific timeline and reference to corrective measures imply a rigorous enforcement program. The hazardous and solid waste mitigation measures on pages 4.15-31 through 4.15-32 reference a “permit program” and “inspection requirements” and specify operating, design, groundwater monitoring, corrective action, and closure and post-closure requirements, but these “requirements” are simply recommendations to APS (*“OSMRE recommends APS implement the measures below”* – p. 4.15-31).

Recommendations: The hazardous and solid waste mitigation measures presented on pages 4.15-31 through 4.15-32 should be enforceable conditions of the project since it is a possibility that coal ash could be regulated under Subtitle D and the standards would not have an enforcement agency on tribal lands. We strongly agree with the need for the identified operating, design, groundwater monitoring, corrective action, and closure and post-closure requirements. Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement does not have a federal action at the FCPP, but the BIA is a cooperating agency and is using this EIS to inform its decision on the FCPP lease renewal. The hazardous and solid waste mitigation measures should be conditions of BIA’s lease approval and enforceable through BIA’s lease conditions and its NEPA Record of Decision. We recommend that they be identified as such in the Final EIS.

Contamination from past CCR mine disposal

Contamination from coal combustion residue (CCR) placed at the Navajo Mine has leached, and will continue to leach, directly into groundwater of the Fruitland Formation coal seams and the Pictured Cliffs Sandstone Formation. The DEIS acknowledges “*high levels of chemical constituents of concern exist within the wells in the historic mining area*” (p. 4.5-44). The DEIS concludes, however, that “*Thus far, negligible impacts have resulted from the CCR placement. It is also unlikely that any significant future effects will ensue from the CCR placement at the Navajo Mine because of the very slow groundwater movement and the likely attenuation of contaminants of concern as they migrate through the subsurface*” and that “*Therefore, past CCR placement at the Navajo Mine is determined to have no impact in the short- or long-term*” (p. 4.5-14). Elsewhere it states that the potential impacts to current and future water uses from CCR placement at the Navajo Mine are minor (p. 4.5-44), despite the identified major impacts for pH, boron, selenium, fluoride and sulfate (p. 4.5-44), with concentrations of

boron, fluoride, sulfate, and total dissolved solids (TDS) exceeding the criteria for livestock watering, a designated post reclamation land use.

These conclusions, especially that of “no impact”, do not appear to be supported. The modeling assumption that contaminants would be attenuated as they migrate through the subsurface has not been confirmed¹. Additionally, the assumption that pollutants would be diluted by the larger San Juan River groundwater flow, even if they are not attenuated during transport to the Fruitland Formation, is brought into question since the transport modeling and sampling that occurred seems to have not fully recognized the possibility of a significant vertical (fracture) flow in the Fruitland Formation. The DEIS indicates that the general flow direction of groundwater in the Fruitland Formation is downward through the interbedded shale and coal units to the lower strata of the Fruitland Formation, with marginal upward movement from the Pictured Cliffs Sandstone into the Fruitland Formation (p. 4.5-13). One can infer from the vertical flow directions that fracture flow might play a prominent role in the movement of bedrock groundwater in the FCPP area². This parameter was not considered in the groundwater modeling of the FCPP area. If vertical (and lateral) fracture flow is substantial, the assumed attenuation would not occur because fracture flow results in a much smaller residence time of groundwater in the bedrock formations and a limited opportunity for the contaminants to be adsorbed by bedrock clay. This would lead to a potentially larger groundwater impact downgradient of CCR placement than is predicted in the DEIS.

The DEIS is not clear whether any ongoing groundwater or surface water monitoring would occur as a condition of this project. The DEIS seems to indicate that only groundwater and surface water monitoring that are part of the new SMCRA permit groundwater monitoring plan (originally from BHP Navajo Coal Company, but which the Navajo Transitional Energy Company will implement) would occur, which relates to the new mine areas and the Pinabete and Cottonwood arroyos. It does not specify any monitoring of the historic contamination areas nor confirm that contaminated groundwater is not reaching the San Juan or Chaco River surface water or alluvia.

Recommendation: The FEIS should include additional information to support its groundwater and surface water impact assessment conclusions. We recommend that monitoring of groundwater quality at Areas I and II of the Navajo Mine and the San Juan River alluvium occur to confirm the model predictions that constituents of concern would be attenuated as

¹ The DEIS references the “Cumulative Hydrologic Impact Assessment of the BHP Billiton Navajo Coal Company, Navajo Mine” for this assumption, but this assessment is not summarized nor appended to the DEIS.

² Wilson, T.H. et al., (2012): “Fracture and 3D seismic interpretations of the Fruitland Formation and cover strata: Implications for CO₂ retention and tracer movement, San Juan Basin Pilot test”. *International Journal of Coal Geology*, Volume 99, 1 September 2012, Pages 35–53. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0166516212000432>

McCord, J. et al., (1992) “Heat-flow data suggest large ground-water fluxes through Fruitland coals of the northern San Juan basin, Colorado-New Mexico”, *International Journal of Coal Geology*, v. 20 no. 5, 1992, p. 419-422. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.coal.2012.02.007>

Haerer and McPherson (2008) “Evaluating the impacts and capabilities of long term subsurface storage in the context of carbon sequestration in the San Juan basin, NM and CO”. *Energy Procedia*, Volume 1, Issue 1, February 2009, Pages 2991–2998. Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies (GHGT-9), 16–20 November 2008, Washington DC, USA. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S187661020900719X>

groundwater travels towards the San Juan River and the Chaco River. Because the groundwater of the Fruitland and Pictured Cliffs Sandstone formations that enter into the alluvium also discharges into the San Juan River in the area of the Navajo Mine, monitoring of the San Juan River surface water quality upstream, along the mine reach, and downstream should occur if the groundwater monitoring results identify elevated levels of pollutants in the San Juan River alluvium that exceed Navajo Nation Water Quality Standards.

In addition, the baseline groundwater quality should be clarified. The DEIS summarizes baseline results for Cottonwood, Pinabete, and No Name Arroyo alluvial wells in Table 4.5-5; however the presentation of this information is not useful. EPA previously commented that this summary does not allow an assessment of ground water impacts by source, and we recommended including some monitoring results by well in the DEIS. In addition, the identification/location of these baseline wells is of importance in order to confirm they do, indeed, represent baseline conditions and do not include contamination that is related to past CCR disposal. This information should be included in the FEIS.

Monitoring for CCR contamination from Four Corners Power Plant

The DEIS reports two areas of groundwater seepage at the existing Dry Fly Ash Disposal Areas (DFADAs) known as the “north seep” and “south seepage area”, which have contaminated groundwater (p. 4.5-57). According to the DEIS, APS has installed extraction wells and constructed the north intercept trench to collect seepage and prevent contamination of the Chaco River, and is currently constructing a south intercept trench to remediate groundwater to protect the river. The DEIS does not indicate how the groundwater is being remediated. With this action and the monitoring of the existing trenches, the DEIS concludes that continued operation and expansion of the DFADAs would have less potential to contaminate local groundwater and water quality in Chaco Wash (p. 4.5-57).

We believe that such actions to capture and treat contaminated groundwater are necessary to ensure that the continued operation and expansion of the DFADAs does not contribute significantly to the existing pollutant load in the Chaco River. The operation of the intercept trenches, as well as the monitoring of groundwater in existing and, possibly, new monitoring wells, is critical to ensuring that any pollutant sources present in ground water that re-surfaces via seeps can be traced so that appropriate corrective actions can be undertaken.

Recommendation: We recommend that any FCPP lease renewal by the BIA include conditions requiring the continued monitoring and remediation of groundwater at the DFADAs. We also recommend that the FEIS identify the method of groundwater remediation that is occurring or will occur.

Dam Safety

We appreciate the information in the DEIS that states that all recommendations from the 2009 Coal Ash Impoundment – Site Specific Assessment Report for the FCPP were completed in 2009 (p. 4.14-4). On p. 4.15-22, however, the DEIS states that APS indicated that the suggested items would be addressed and completed prior to the end of 2009. The DEIS specifically identifies some of the recommendations, but does not indicate whether the following are occurring: (From section 12.4 of the recommendations):

- Continue monitoring seepage at the downstream toe of the south embankment (Pond #4 toe) for any changes in seepage quantity and flow rate or evidence that the flow is carrying soil/ash particles from the embankment.

- Expand program to include additional monitoring of potential seepage under the dam at the northwest corner of the LAI, where the LAI embankment was not tied-in to the underlying Pond 3-4 embankment to provide continuity of seepage control, and where a potential seepage pathway exists if the HDPE lining fails. Install additional piezometers to address this potential seepage pathway and expand documentation in APS dam safety inspections to note any evidence of seepage near the downstream toe of the dam in this area.
- Repair or replace the two settlement plates that do not appear to be providing useful information and that may have been damaged during construction or maintenance activities.

Recommendation: For clarity in the FEIS, indicate whether the above recommended actions and monitoring from the 2009 Coal Ash Impoundment – Site Specific Assessment Report for the FCPP are occurring. If the requested monitoring has occurred, include results of seepage monitoring efforts.

Dust Control from CCR Management

The DEIS provides information regarding the FCPP Dust Control Plan. The DEIS states that, “*During placement of CCR, compaction control, added moisture, and slope control are used, as well as dust suppressant and periodic fabric covering of slopes*”. The DEIS states that DFADA 1 and 2 will continue to be used until they reach capacity in 2016. DFADA 1 is tallest on the west berm, approximately 110 feet above natural grade (p. 4.15-12). The DEIS also states that APS would construct five additional DFADAs to accommodate future disposal of all fly ash, bottom ash, and flue gas desulfurization waste generated through the duration of the lease term. Each site is anticipated to be approximately 60 acres and approximately 120 feet high (p. xiii and p. 3-15). On page 4.15-27, the DEIS states that the new DFADA’s would be approximately 80 feet high, so it is not clear which height represents the height above natural grade.

If the height of the DFADAs will be 120 feet above natural grade, to the extent there is any settlement in the down-wind directions, fugitive dust control on such a high active face would be difficult to maintain. EPA has received complaints from nearby residents regarding fugitive dust, therefore renewed efforts at dust control, and monitoring of dust control effectiveness, is essential.

Recommendation: Clarify in the FEIS whether the height of the DFADAs will be 80 feet or 120 feet above natural grade. For either height, we recommend that the DFADAs be continuously sprayed with water to ensure dust is controlled. Slope control and the other dust control measures in the Dust Control Plan should be monitored regularly to ensure they are effective. When wind speeds are elevated, more frequent dust control should be implemented.

We recommend that a dust complaint procedure and hotline be developed to allow local residents to report ineffective dust control conditions. APS should conduct outreach to the local population, in Navajo as well as English, to ensure awareness of this complaint procedure.

Cumulative Health Impacts

The EIS should acknowledge the cumulative health impacts that the residents in the vicinity of the project experience. The DEIS largely relies on the air quality analysis conclusions for its public health impact assessment. The DEIS states that the combined impacts to air quality from the Navajo Mine and the Four Corners Power Plant (FCPP) are minor (p. 4.1-85) because modeled criteria pollutant emissions meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). EPA sets the NAAQS at a level requisite to protect public health with an adequate margin of safety, taking into consideration effects on

susceptible populations, based on the scientific literature; however, as we previously commented, EPA's Particulate Matter and Ozone Integrated Science Assessments (U.S. EPA, 2009 and U.S. EPA, 2013) determined that there is no evidence of a population-level threshold in PM- and ozone-related health effects in the epidemiological literature. This means that there is not a level below which there is no impact. Instead, health impacts that occur below the standards are assumed to be more uncertain than those occurring above the standards.

The DEIS acknowledges that the cumulative public health effects depend on the respiratory health status of residents in the area (p. 4.18-54), yet it does not appear that respiratory health was considered in the conclusions that project impacts to public health from the FCPP are negligible for criteria pollutants (p. xli, p. 4.17-22) and minor for hazardous air pollutants (p. 4.17-24), and that cumulative impacts to public health from both the FCPP and the Mine are minor (p. 4.18-54). The DEIS does disclose San Juan County's most recent Community Health Profile, which found that San Juan County has a higher incidence of chronic lower respiratory disease, comprised of chronic bronchitis, asthma, and emphysema, compared to New Mexico or the rest of the United States. It also cites a study by the New Mexico Department of Health that found that San Juan County residents are 34 percent more likely to have asthma-related medical visits after 20 parts per billion increases in local ozone levels (p. 4.17-4). A study by Bunnell, et al, also cited in the DEIS, documents disproportionately high rates of respiratory disease in the Indian Health Service's Shiprock Service area (p. 4.11-14). None of this information appears to have been factored into the DEIS' conclusions regarding cumulative public health impacts.

The DEIS also discusses the unique situation of in-home coal burning from coal provided free of charge to Navajos who reside within a certain radius of the mine, which was part of the original mining lease agreement. The DEIS states that, from October through March, coal for personal use by project employees and local Chapter residents is placed in the Community Coal Stockpile, located adjacent to the Navajo Mine Area III office (p. 2-12). Because many Navajo are able to obtain cheap or free coal, and they do not have access, or affordable access, to electricity – an existing environmental justice vulnerability -- many use coal to heat their homes. It is not unusual for the coal to be burned in stoves that were not designed to burn coal, nor is it unusual that the stoves are poorly maintained or improperly vented. The Bunnell study revealed that air quality from coal combustion inside dwellings used for cooking and heating had an average 24-hour wintertime PM_{2.5} level exceeding EPA's ambient air standard for PM_{2.5} (note that EPA does not regulate indoor air pollution levels). This cumulative impact, which directly relates to the mine operations for which this EIS is being prepared, should be considered in the cumulative public health impact conclusions, as well as referenced in the environmental justice impact conclusions.

Recommendation: We recommend that the cumulative public health impact assessment conclusions factor in the respiratory health status of residents in the area, as the DEIS states should occur on page 4.18-54. The FEIS should document how the lack of access to electric power and the provision of free or low-cost coal by the project have contributed to indoor air quality cumulative impacts, as well as outdoor air pollution during stagnant winter weather conditions. Because the DEIS does not define what would constitute a moderate or major impact to cumulative public health and does not define a level of significance, we recommend identifying mitigation measures for this impact, since the existing public health environment is severely compromised (health outcomes for Navajo are worse than for the general population in San Juan County; life expectancy is lower, mortality rates far exceed the national rates; investment in healthcare services on Navajo land is about half of that for the general population; and healthcare disparities between Navajo and the general population are pronounced due to lack

of access and funding - p. 4.10-15). The DEIS notes that the results from the Bunnell study suggest that the added risk from in-home coal burning could be reduced by making relatively simple and inexpensive changes to methods of home heating (p. 4.17-4). Such changes should be further discussed and identified as possible mitigation for this cumulative public health and environmental justice impact.

EPA previously recommended mitigation for cumulative impacts from in-home coal combustion supplied by the continued operation of the mine. At a minimum, the following potential mitigation measures should be identified and considered: funding for replacement of old stoves with more efficient stoves appropriate for the fuel types being used; funding for replacement of old coal and wood stoves with propane gas heaters; assistance to the affected community for residential solar, wind or other electrical generation projects; assistance to Navajo Tribal Utility Authority for local electricity connections and subsidies to any affected residents; and education on how to properly operate, vent, and maintain existing stoves, perhaps locating this information in Navajo at the Community Coal Stockpile or producing an instructional video to play in Indian Health Service clinic waiting rooms. Selection of any of the above measures should be done in consultation with the affected residents.

Excluding Fugitive Dust from the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA)

EPA previously commented that fugitive dust should have been included in the Human Health Risk Assessment and that uncertainty regarding the assumption of equal toxicity of PM species does not warrant the exclusion of fugitive dust from the impacts analysis (on the basis of having a lower proportion of metals and other toxic substances). OSM has chosen, instead, to include a discussion of potential impacts from PM_{2.5}, including baseline and projected future emissions.

Recommendation: We recommend that the FEIS clearly state that fugitive dust was not included in the HHRA.

Potential for Mine Methane Capture

The DEIS quantifies the fugitive methane emissions that would be liberated from coal seams during mining (p. 4.2-22). Methane has a global warming potential more than 20 times higher than CO₂ for a 100-year period³. Methane can be captured at surface mines through pre-mine drainage, either from the surface or through horizontal boreholes. EPA is aware that there are surface mines in operation in the Powder River Basin in Wyoming and elsewhere around the world that are recovering methane through pre-mine drainage and, thus, mitigating the impact from this powerful greenhouse gas. Also note that surface mine methane capture is now eligible for carbon credits - a market tracking system that supports the implementation of California's Cap-and-Trade Program - for greenhouse gas emission reductions associated with the capture and destruction of methane in the U.S. that would otherwise be vented into the atmosphere as a result of mining operations at active underground and surface coal mines. See: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/newsrel/newsrelease.php?id=602>. In addition, the DEIS states that BIA is currently evaluating, under NEPA, Western Oil & Gas's proposal to develop 600 natural gas wells in the Burnham, Upper Fruitland, and Nenahnezad/San Juan Chapters, which would involve the installation of new pipeline (p. 4.18-13).

³ <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases.html>

Recommendation: We recommend that the FEIS discuss the feasibility of capturing methane from Navajo Mine. Include the economic benefits that could occur from selling the carbon credits in California's Cap-and-Trade Program, as well as the possible interconnection or use of natural gas infrastructure nearby from Western Oil & Gas's proposed natural gas wells.

Additional information regarding methane recovery at surface mines is available in the following EPA documents:

- "Case Study – Methane Recovery at Surface Mines" - <http://epa.gov/coalbed/docs/CMOP-Methane-Recovery-Surface-Mines-March-2014.pdf>
- "US Surface Coal Mine Methane Recovery Opportunities" - http://epa.gov/coalbed/docs/cmm_recovery_opps_surface.pdf

Petroleum Contamination

The DEIS states that "*Secondary containment is not provided for mobile refueling vehicles in areas where NTEC staff are present, and the maximum amount of time before a discharge would be detected is less than 24 hours*" (p. 4.15-6). It is unclear why it could take hours before a discharge from mobile refueling is detected. The DEIS states that the bioremediation of petroleum-contaminated soils takes place on-site (p. 4.15-6). The source of this contaminated soil is not identified.

Recommendation: The FEIS should identify the source of the petroleum-contaminated soils and indicate whether they are originating from mobile refueling operations. We recommend that the applicant review and, as needed, update its Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plan to identify applicable general containment or drainage control measures, as required by 40 CFR 112.7(c) for mobile refuelers and mobile refueling, to ensure that releases associated with these operations are detected as soon as possible. For the continued operation of the FCPP and Navajo Mine, we recommend that additional measures be explored to prevent and contain releases when mobile refuelers may be unattended and during mobile refueling operations.

Additional comments

- Table 4.1-28 on p. 4.1-67 is confusing. The second column is labeled "Estimated Post-2014 Baseline Emissions", but it is not clear what is meant by post-2014 emissions. The text says that the reductions in the third column represent the reductions from fully implementing BART, but our estimate for mercury reductions under BART implementation is 61%, not the 81% listed. It is possible that the table is intended to represent the additional reductions in mercury that could occur from implementation of the mercury and air toxics standards (MATS). If so, this should be clarified in the FEIS and a definition of "Post-2014 Baseline Emissions" should be provided.
- In Table 4.5-6 on page 4.5-20, the result for mercury is listed as >0.001. Should this have been <0.001?
- In the Hazardous and Solid Waste chapter, the PDEIS states that "specific study of the disposal of CCR in Navajo Mine has not identified adverse effects" (p. 4.15-5). This does not appear to be supported, given the contamination identified in the Water Resources chapter. Groundwater contamination is an adverse effect.